Pomes, Michael

From: Drouare, Douglas
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2015 2:16 PM
To: mark.junker@sacfoxenviro.org
Cc: Groskinsky, Brenda; Morris, Jennifer; Whitney Bynum; Raymond Bosch; Stockdale, Margaret
Subject: RE: Thanks, Feedback, and name for contact

Categories: EZ Record - Shared

Thanks for the update Mark. It sounds like you have recovered some additional fuel since the last time we spoke. I believe you previously said that 1,400 gallons were unaccounted for. Sounds like that is down to 400 gallons now. That is good news. Our initial letter regarding LUST responsibility should be going out the door in the mail tomorrow. I will e-mail you a copy as soon as it is ready.

Douglas E. Drouare, CPG
USEPA, Region 7, AWMD - STOP
11201 Renner Boulevard
Lenexa, Kansas 66219
(913) 551-7299
drouare.douglas@epa.gov

From: Morris, Jennifer
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2015 1:33 PM
To: mark.junker@sacfoxenviro.org
Cc: Groskinsky, Brenda; Drouare, Douglas
Subject: Thanks, Feedback, and name for contact

Mark,

Thank you for your timely report and for the update on the Fuel Station Response to the spill. I am glad you are receiving the technical assistance necessary from Doug Druare and Megan Schutte.

The research you are doing sounds very interesting. I would like to visit with you sometime today to clarify roles and responsibilities as you provide assistance to the Fuel Station in response to the spill. I feel sure that you recognize your role as one of independent oversight as the response goes forward. I know that in last week's training about spill response, you saw the importance of making the distinction between your role (or EPA Superfund Role) and the role of the Responsible Party. You are providing tech assistance and facilitating the advice from others who are providing assistance to the RP. The RP is following their spill plan, using insurance to cover costs of cleanup, or accessing national funds for tank cleanups and may need guidance about what standards to use for cleanup. Where federal rules do not specify a standard, you as the TRP program can establish a standard, oversee the cleanup and verify it has been completed.

I think it is possible that someone who is not aware of our recent training and discussions might misunderstand when you refer to "I" and "we" regarding procedures to clean up and/or safely reclaim product and perceive you as a decision maker on-scene for the Responsible Party. I know you are aware of the limits of your role in the Tribal Response Program and the importance of maintaining an independent oversight/tech assistance function. Perhaps when preparing a report about this or other such spills in the future, avoid using pronouns (especially the Royal We) and stick with terms like the Responsible Party or the Tribal Response Program, the TRP, and reserve I for personal action as the TRP representative.

(No need to rewrite this email, I am just providing this summary for the records so the grant file documents our understanding.)

The contact for the Regional Science Liaison in Brenda Groskinsky. Her contact info is Groskinsky.Brenda@epa.gov; 913-551-7188

As I mentioned, she is an Office of Research and development employee assigned to the Region to ensure ORD research is beneficial and useful for application in the Regions. She is also currently the Acting Chair of the National Tribal Science Council, representing EPA. They have had a focus recently on climate change and adaptation issues in Indian Country. I believe she would be helpful in discussing your presentation on the impact of Climate Change on the water tables and how fluctuation impacts remediation and risk models based on stable groundwater levels. She is familiar with Doug Cluck from NOAA with whom you mentioned working and she might have a good contact or two for you to explore at the USGS. She might also be interested in your theory about what led to the catastrophic tank failure last week and possible similarities with one in Tonganoxie. Occasionally ORD seeks research recommendations. Feel free to ask her if this is something that might be of interest for further research by the agency.

As far as other things to do, barring some potential risk of failure of other tanks per your theory, the immediate risk to health is passed and the risk to the environment is contained. It seems you have a responsive Responsible Party who is actively working to remediate the problem. I would stay engaged with the technical contacts at EPA and stay engaged to determine whether or not the TRP needs to establish a cleanup standard and to certify the cleanup is completed. Now is a good time to pull out you SOP for spill response and see if there is anything you want to update, revise, or elaborate on given the new experiences here. You may also want to look at what potential compliance assistance or outreach needs may be needed to prevent spills (and possible contamination that would impair future reuse.) Also identify any gaps in your knowledge and in program response authorities (assisters from EPA and KDHE etc) that inhibited your ability to respond or inhibited the ability of the responsible party to move forward. By identifying these gaps you can target these for work in the next workplan capacity development.

Sounds like things are on track. I am glad you were available to provide tech assistance at the start of the incident, especially including the need to contact the spill line. That advice likely will benefit the RP significantly because had they not done it there might have been unintended consequences.

Thanks for keeping me in the loop. I am in today so feel free to call me if you want to discuss anything!

Jennifer Morris

From: M.Junker [mailto:mark.junker@sacfoxenviro.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2015 11:36 AM
To: Morris, Jennifer
Subject: quarterly-etc

Good morning,
I am attaching the quarterly, revised work plan and budget narrative and thought I would give you a brief run down on what has been happening with the tank at the Truck Stop.

The spill occurred in a 15,000 gallon tank containing mid grade (87 octane) gasoline. This tank was attached via a manifold to 12,000 gallon tank. It was at first estimated the spill was in the neighborhood of 5,000 gallons. It is believed that the tank failed catastrophically and that hydraulic pressure underneath the tank had caused a breach which allowed water and gravel to enter the tank. This was tentatively confirmed by a camera probe used to inspect the tank on July 27.
On the 28th we received laboratory data for the contents of the frac tank from Robert Trump of Total Petroleum Service and Pace Labs that was brought in immediately following the incident. The

results were pretty consistent with what we expected. The gas had separated from the water and we almost 2400 gallons of fuel that can be treated for regular use.
The water contains Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylene which we hope can be adsorbed with activated carbon. So we have a bit of an outline for how we are going to proceed.

I am no expert so I have been researching the use of the activated carbon while the video data is processed at Tankology headquarters in Austin, TX. The EPA has a technical bulletin for selecting adsorbtion systems and I am wading through it. We should know next week the full extent of the tank failure and the cost of using the activated carbon to treat the waste water.

I am currently working with Doug Drouare from EPA and Megan Schutte from KDHE and keeping them in loop. The good news is that right now it looks like we only have about 400 gallons of fuel unaccounted for at this time and we believe most of that is within the confines of the tank cavity.

I am really interested in pursuing some more information about the tank with lady you referred to last week. I heard about a recent spill in Toganoxie that may have been caused by similar factors. If you can think of anything I need to or should do please let me know.

Thanks and have a great afternoon.

Mark Junker
Tribal Response Coordinator
Sac & Fox Nation Of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska
(785) 742-4706